



000 2936 2879

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	10/002,936
Filing Date	11/15/2001
First Named Inventor	Yueh-Ming Teng
Group Art Unit	2879
Examiner Name	Ashok Patel
Attorney Docket Number	59

Total Number of Pages in This Submission **3**

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

- ☐ Fee Transmittal Form
- ☐ Fee Attached
- ☒ Amendment / Reply
- ☐ After Final
- ☐ Affidavits/declaration(s)
- ☐ Extension of Time Request
- ☐ Express Abandonment Request
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement
- ☐ Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- ☐ Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
- ☐ Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53

- ☐ Assignment Papers (for an Application)
- ☐ Drawing(s)
- ☐ Licensing-related Papers
- ☐ Petition
- ☐ Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
- ☐ Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address
- ☐ Terminal Disclaimer
- ☐ Request for Refund
- ☐ CD, Number of CD(s) _____

- ☐ After Allowance Communication to Group
- ☐ Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
- ☐ Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
- ☐ Proprietary Information
- ☐ Status Letter
- ☒ Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):

- Return Postcard

Remarks

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm
or
Individual name

THOMAS E. HILL

Signature

Thomas E. Hill

Date

August 29, 2003

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date:

August 29, 2003

Typed or printed name

Diana W. Strong

Signature

Date

Aug 29, 2003

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0-2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Yueh-Ming Teng

Serial No: 10/002,936

Filed: November 15, 2001

Title: APPLICATION OF MULTI-LAYER
ANTISTATIC/ANTIREFLECTIVE
COATING TO VIDEO DISPLAY
SCREEN BY SPUTTERING

Attorney's Docket No.: 59

Confirmation No: 5411

Group Art: 2879

Examiner: Ashok Patel

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail before the last scheduled pickup, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to, MAIL STOP NON-FEE AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 29, 2003.

DIANA W. STRONG

MAIL STOP NON-FEE AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT A

Sir:

In response to the election requirement set forth in the Office Action of August 25, 2003, Applicant offers the following comments.

Applicant elects to prosecute in this application claims directed to invention I as defined in the aforementioned Office Action by the Examiner. Thus, Applicant elects to prosecute claims 1-6, 13-16 and 18-21. Thus, claims 7-12 stand withdrawn from the subject application.

In response to the Examiner's election requirement based on the Examiner's position that the claims directed to the recited method and recited product represent distinct inventions, Applicant offers the following comments in traversal of this position.

As stated by the Examiner in the Office Action, inventions are distinct and thus subject to an election requirement in a pending patent application if it can be shown that (1) the claimed process can be used to make other materially different products, or (2) that the claimed product can be made by another materially different process. In the present case, the coating, or product, recited in claims 7-12 cannot be formed by a process different than that recited in claims 1-6, 13-16 and 18-21. The unique process/method recited in claims 1-6, 13-16 and 18-21 permits the inner metallic antistatic layer of the multi-layer coating recited in claim 7 to be provided with a precisely controlled thickness within a range of 18-35 nm and a precisely controlled light refractive index within the range of 1.8-2.2. Similarly, the inventive method/process recited in pending claims 1-6, 13-16 and 18-21 allows the outer antireflective layer of the video display panel multi-layer coating to be provided with a precisely controlled thickness within the range of 110-140 nm and a precisely controlled light refractive index within the range of 1.3-1.47. There is no other known method other than the sputtering process recited in claims 1-6, 13-16 and 18-21 for precisely controlling the thickness and also the refractive index of an inner metallic antistatic layer and an outer antireflective layer used in a multi-layer coating for a video display panel. Not only is there no other known process or method other than that recited in claims 1-6, 13-16 and 18-21 for producing the multi-layer coating of claims 7-12, but the process recited in these claims is not adapted for use in producing another product materially different than the multi-layer coating recited in claim 7-12. The Examiner alleges that one of ordinary skill could make the claimed product recited in claims 7-12 by spraying the inner metallic antistatic layer rather than depositing

In re application of Yueh-Ming Teng
Serial No. 10/002,936

it by sputtering as recited in method claims 1-6, 13-16 and 18-21. However, spraying of this type of layer on the surface of a video display panel will not provide the precise control of coating layer thickness and thus the precise control of the layer's optical characteristics such as its refractive index. In fact, Applicant developed the present invention to replace known methods such as spin and spray coating and vacuum vapor deposition which do not provide the precise coating layer thickness control of the claimed invention. There is no known method other than that recited in claims 1-6, 13-16 and 18-21 for controlling the thickness of an inner metallic antistatic layer and an outer antireflective layer deposited on a video display panel as precisely recited in these claims other than the claimed sputtering process. For these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the election requirement be withdrawn and that all of pending claims 1-16 and 18-21 be examined in this application.

With this amendment, this application is now believed to be in condition for examination.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 29, 2003

Thomas E. Hill

Thomas E. Hill, Reg. No. 28,955
Attorney for Applicant
EMRICH & DITHMAR
300 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: 312-663-9800
Fax: 312-633-9822